

Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-643
Appl. No. 10/691,328
Amdt. Dated: June 9, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 11, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 46 are pending. Claims 1 to 8 and 25 to 46 were allowed. Independent Claims 9, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 have been amended.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 21 has been corrected as has page 18. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 9 to 24 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, due to the word "comprising". All of the claims have been amended to delete this word and to add "of" or "of the formula". Reconsideration is requested.


Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Oskam et al (Journal of Organometallic Chemistry, Vol. 459, No. 1-2, pp. 185-198 (1993)) and Claim 21 was rejected over Gibson et al. (J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., Vol. 2, pp. 161-165 (1999)). These claims have been amended to call for compounds 5 and 6 on page 18 of the specification wherein the substitution on the phenyl-N= group is unsaturated (i.e. pentene). Neither reference suggests a compound with this structure. These compounds are intermediates in Scheme 1 shown on page

Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-643
Appl. No. 10/691,328
Amdt. Dated: June 9, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 11, 2006

20 of the application. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

It is now believed that Claims 1 to 46 are in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,



Ian C. McLeod
Registration No. 20,931

McLeod & Moyne, P.C.
2190 Commons Parkway
Okemos, Michigan 48864
(517) 347-4100
Fax: (517) 347-4103